BEFORE THE DIVISION OF MEDICAL QUALITY BOARD OF MEDICAL QUALITY ASSURANCE DEPARTMENT OF CONSUMER AFFAIRS STATE OF CALIFORNIA

In the Matter of the Accusation Against: Russell B. Steele, M.D. Certificate # G014669 Respondent.))))))))
DEC	ISION
The attached Stipula	tion is hereby adopted by the
Division of Medical Quality of	the Board of Medical Quality
Assurance as its Decision in the	he above-entitled matter.
This Decision shall l	become effective on
April 14, 1988	
IT IS SO ORDERED	March 15, 1988 .
	DIVISION OF MEDICAL QUALITY BOARD OF MEDICAL QUALITY ASSURANCE Theresa Claassen, Secretary-Treasurer

JOHN K. VAN DE KAMP, Attorney General of the State of California 1 JANA L. TUTON Deputy Attorney General 2 1515 K Street, Suite 511 P. O. Box 944255 3 Sacramento, California 94244-2550 Telephone: (916) 324-5342 4 Attorneys for Complainant 5 6 7 BEFORE THE DIVISION OF MEDICAL QUALITY 8 BOARD OF MEDICAL QUALITY ASSURANCE DEPARTMENT OF CONSUMER AFFAIRS 9 STATE OF CALIFORNIA 10 In the Matter of the Accusation) Against: 11 RUSSELL B. STEELE, M.D. 12 2415 W. Vine Street, #106 Lodi, California 95240 13

No. D-3601

STIPULATION

Physician's and Surgeon's Certificate No. G-014669 Respondent.

Respondent Russell B. Steele, M.D., through his counsel Eugene G. Walton, Esq., and the Board of Medical Quality Assurance, Division of Medical Quality, through its counsel Deputy Attorney General Jana L. Tuton, do hereby enter into the following stipulation:

- Respondent Russell B. Steele, M.D. hereby acknowledges receipt of Accusation No. D-3601, Statement to Respondent, and copies of the Notice of Defense form.
- Respondent has retained Eugene G. Walton to be his attorney in Case No. D-3601 and has counseled with Mr. Walton

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

- concerning the charges and allegations contained in Accusation

 No. D-3601 and the effect of this stipulation.
 - 3. Respondent is fully aware of his right to a hearing on the charges and allegations contained in Accusation No. D-3601, his right to reconsideration, appeal, and any and all rights which may be accorded pursuant to the California Administrative Procedure Act and the laws of the State of California.
 - 4. Respondent hereby freely and voluntarily waives his right to a hearing, reconsideration, appeal and any and all other rights which may be accorded by the California Administrative Procedure Act and the laws of the State of California with regard to Accusation No. D-3601.
 - 5. Respondent stipulates that he is subject to disciplinary action as alleged in paragraphs 7 and 8 of Accusation No. D-3601 which is attached as Exhibit A and incorporated by reference herein.
 - 6. Since September 1987, respondent has successfully completed 179 credit hours of continuing medical education in family practice and internal medicine, including 50 hours in "Intensive Review of Internal Medicine" at Harvard Medical School and 50 hours in "Family Medicine Review" at the University of Kentucky School of Medicine. Documentation of these courses is attached hereto as Exhibit B.
 - 7. Based on the foregoing stipulations, the Division of Medical Quality, Board of Medical Quality Assurance, may issue the following order:

- A. The license to practice medicine and surgery in the State of California heretofore issued to respondent is hereby revoked; provided, however, that execution of this order of revocation is stayed and respondent is placed on probation for five (5) years upon the following terms and conditions:
 - 1. Within 30 days of the effective date of this decision, respondent shall take and pass an oral clinical examination in family practice to be administered by the Division or its designee. If respondent fails this examination, respondent must take and pass a re-examination consisting of a written as well as an oral clinical examination. The waiting period between repeat examinations shall be at three month intervals until success is achieved. The Division shall pay the cost of the first examination and respondent shall pay the cost of any subsequent re-examinations. Respondent shall not practice medicine until respondent has passed the required examination and has been so notified by the Division in writing.
 - 2. Within 90 days of the effective date of this decision, and on an annual basis thereafter, respondent shall submit to the Division for its prior approval an educational program or course related to family practice, which shall not be less than 60 hours the first year of probation and 40 hours for each year thereafter. The 60 hour program during the first year shall include at least two programs of four days' duration or longer. The Division may, in its sole discretion, include any or all of the courses documented in Exhibit B. This program shall be in addition to the Continuing Medical Education

requirements for re-licensure. Following the completion of each
course, the Division or its designee may administer an
examination to test respondent's knowledge of the course.

Respondent shall provide proof of attendance for all medical

education courses.

3. Within 30 days of the effective date of this decision, respondent shall submit to the Division for its prior approval a plan of practice in which respondent's practice shall be monitored by another physician in respondent's field of practice, who shall provide periodic reports to the Division.

If the monitor quits, or no longer is available, respondent shall not practice until a new monitor has been substituted, through nomination by respondent and approval by the Division.

- 4. Respondent shall not practice obstetrics.
- 5. Respondent shall obey all federal, state and local laws, and all rules governing the practice of medicine in California.
 - 6. Respondent shall submit quarterly declarations under penalty of perjury on forms provided by the Division, stating whether there has been compliance with all the conditions of probation.
 - 7. Respondent shall comply with the Division's probation surveillance program.
 - 8. Respondent shall appear in person for interviews with the Division's medical consultant upon request at various intervals and with reasonable notice.

- 9. The period of probation shall not run during the
- 2 time respondent is residing or practicing outside the
- jurisdiction of California. If, during probation, respondent
- 4 moves out of California to reside or practice elsewhere,
- 5 respondent is required to immediately notify the Division in
- 6 writing of the date of departure, and the date of return, if
- 7 any.
- 8 10. Upon successful completion of probation,
- 9 respondent's certificate will be fully restored. Respondent may
- petition the Board for modification of probation after a period
- of not less than one year has elapsed from the effective date of
- 12 this decision.
- 11. If respondent violates probation in any respect, the
- 14 Division after giving respondent notice and the opportunity to
- 15 be heard, may revoke probation and impose the revocation that
- 16 was stayed. If an accusation or petition to revoke probation is
- 17 filed against respondent during probation, the Division shall
- 18 have continuing jurisdiction until the matter is final, and the
- 19 period of probation shall be extended until the matter is final.
- It is agreed that the terms set forth herein shall be
- 21 null and void and not binding upon the parties hereto unless
- 22 approved by the Board of Medical Quality Assurance of the State
- 23 of California.
- 24 ///
- 25 ///
- 26 ///
- 27 ///

1		
2	DATED:	
3	1-26-88	JOHN K. VAN DE KAMP, Attorney General
4	1 20 00	of the State of California
5		Jana J. Duto
6		JANA L. TUTON Deputy Attorney General
7		Attorneys for Complainant
8	DATED:	Accorneys for complainance
9	DATED.	Nous Allollow
10		EUGENE G. WALTON, ESQ. Attorney for Respondent
11	DATED:	
12		Tunul 3 (tecto)
13		RUSSELL B. STEELE, M.D.
14		Respondent
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
26	03573110-	
27	SA87AD0067	

OURT PAPER TATE OF CALIFORNIA TD. 113 (REV. 8-72)

```
1
     JOHN K. VAN DE KAMP, Attorney General
       of the State of California
 2
     JANA L. TUTON
       Deputy Attorney General
 3
     1515 K Street, Suite 511
     P. O. Box 944255
 4
     Sacramento, California 94244-2550
     Telephone: (916) 324-5342
 5
     Attorneys for Complainant
 6
 7
 8
                                BEFORE THE
                       DIVISION OF MEDICAL QUALITY
 9
                    BOARD OF MEDICAL QUALITY ASSURANCE
                      DEPARTMENT OF CONSUMER AFFAIRS
10
                           STATE OF CALIFORNIA
11
     In the Matter of the Accusation
                                              No.D-3601
     Against:
12
          RUSSELL B. STEELE, M.D.
                                              ACCUSATION
13
          2415 W. Vine St., #106
          Lodi, California 95240
14
          License No. G-014669
15
                         Respondent.
16
17
               Kenneth Wagstaff, the complainant herein, alleges as
18
     follows:
19
                   He is the Executive Director of the Board of
20
     Medical Quality Assurance of the State of California and makes
21
     and files this accusation in his official capacity and not
22
     otherwise.
23
                   On or about May 13, 1968, respondent Russell B.
24
     Steele, M.D. (hereinafter "respondent"), was issued physician's
25
     and surgeon's certificate number G-014669 under the laws of the
26
     State of California. Said certificate is presently in full
27
     force and effect.
```

- 3. Section 2234 of the Business and Professions Code
- 2 provides that the Division of Medical Quality of the Board of
- 3 Medical Quality Assurance shall take action against a holder of
- 4 " a physician's and surgeon's certificate who is guilty of
- 5 unprofessional conduct.
- 6 4. Section 2234, subdivision (b), of the Code
- 7 provides that gross negligence constitutes unprofessional
- 8 conduct.
- 9 5. Section 2234, subdivision (d), of the Code
- 10 provides that incompetence constitutes unprofessional conduct.
- 11 6. Section 2293, subdivision (c), of the Code
- 12 provides that failure of two professional competency
- examinations shall be grounds for the Division to file an
- 14 accusation charging the examinee with incompetency under section
- 15 2234, subdivision (d), of the Code.
- 7. Respondent is subject to disciplinary action
- pursuant to section 2234 of the Code in that he is guilty of
- unprofessional conduct in violation of section 2234,
- 19 subdivisions (b) and (d) as more particularly alleged
- 20 hereinafter:
- A. On August 18, 1983, respondent commenced
- obstetrical care of Shane H. During the course of his prenatal
- 23 care and treatment of Shane H., respondent made no evaluation of
- 24 size-discrepancy in early pregnancy; no fundal measurements
- after approximately 20 weeks; no evaluation of the patient's
- 26 excessive weight gain; and no pelvic examination after February
- 27 10, 1984. Respondent failed to inform Shane H. of the risks of

1 post-dates pregnancies and failed to formulate an appropriate

- 2 course of care at Shane H.'s last office visit on March 15,
- 3 1984, when she was 11 days post-dates.
- B. At 7:00 p.m. on March 17, 1984, Shane H. was
- 5 admitted to the labor area of the hospital. Respondent was
- 6 notified at a restaurant at 7:25, but refused to come despite
- 7 difficulty in monitoring the fetal heartbeat, and an elevated
- 8 maternal temperature and white blood count. Respondent was
- 9 contacted again, but did not arrive at the hospital until on or
- 10 about 8:55. No sonogram was done. No internal monitoring of
- 11 the fetal heartbeat was done. Despite failure of labor to
- 12 progress for several hours, no consultation was requested. At
- 13 12:50 a.m., respondent returned to the hospital and recommended
- 14 a Cesarean section. A still-born infant was delivered by
- 15 Cesarean section.
- 8. Respondent is subject to disciplinary action
- 17 pursuant to section 2234, subdivision (a), of the Code as more
- 18 particularly alleged hereinafter:
- A. On June 4, 1986, respondent took a professional
- 20 competency examination pursuant to section 2293. Respondent
- 21 failed the examination.
- B. On August 28, 1986, respondent took a professional
- 23 competency examination pursuant to section 2293. Respondent
- 24 failed the examination.
- 25 WHEREFORE, complainant prays that the Division of
- 26 Medical Quality hold a hearing on the matters alleged herein and
- following the hearing issue a decision:

1	1. Suspending or revoking the license issued to
2	Russell B. Steele, M.D.; and
3	2. Taking such other and further action as is deemed
4	proper.
5	DATED: January 13, 1987
6	KENNETH WAGSTAFF
7	Executive Director Board of Medical Quality Assurance
8	Department of Consumer Affairs State of California
9	Complainant
10	,
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22 23	
24	
25	
26	
. 0	